

Appl. No. 10/750,275  
Amdt. dated October 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 3, 2005

Docket No. 10407-989

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action mailed August 3, 2005, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Claims 1-31 and 33-46 are pending in the present application. Claim 32 has been canceled, without prejudice. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

#### **1. Claim Objections: Claims 20-30**

The Examiner objected to claims 20-30 as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the currency is issued" in the body of the claims. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 20 to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitation by removing the definite article "the" preceding the limitation "currency."

#### **2. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph: Claims 4-6 and 27-29**

The Examiner rejected claims 4-6 and 27-29 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the step of the "causing a reaction of prompting the player to add an additional value or to change the credit value if only partial credits exists" is not disclosed in the specification.

In response, the Applicants submit that there is sufficient disclosure in the specification to provide written description to enable this step in claims 4-6 and 27-29. The Applicants submit that prompting a player to add an additional value is disclosed in FIG. 8 and the related text on page 16 (lines 7-16). In particular, the Applicants submit that a player is prompted to add additional value, e.g., "if the sum [of the vouchers] is less than the credit value, the game loops back to step 802 to accept another voucher." (See, page 16, lines 7-16). The specification also discloses that the credit value may be changed if only partial credits exist. Specifically, on page 11 (lines 15-20), the game provides the user with an option to change the credit value thereby allowing the player to change the value of a wager during game play. Otherwise stated, a player can change the credit value in the situation where only partial credits exist.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the specification provides sufficient written description to enable claims 4-6 and 27-29. Thus, the Applicants submit that the claims conform to all applicable requirements under 35 USC §112 and respectfully request that the rejection be

Appl. No. 10/750,275  
Amdt. dated October 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 3, 2005

Docket No. 10407-989

withdrawn.

**3. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102: Claims 1, 2, 4-21, 25-30, 32, 40, and 44-46**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-21, 25-30, 32, 40, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilms. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. For the sake of brevity, the rejections of the independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41 are discussed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Applicants submit that Wilms does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 4-21, 25-30, 32, 40, and 44-46. More specifically, with respect to independent claims 1 and 33, the Wilms reference does not disclose a gaming method “allowing a player to play the game for partial credits.” In sharp contrast, the game disclosed in Wilms only allows a player to play with full credits. Specifically, the Wilms reference discloses that “when the number of credits available to the player...drops below a single unit value of the denomination being played, the player must terminate the game and cash out or select a lower wagering denomination.” (See, col. 7, lines 59-67). The Applicants submit that reducing the wagered denomination value is not the same as allowing wagering with a partial denomination value. For example, if a player was wagering at a \$1.00 denomination and the player has \$0.95 left, the player must cash out or lower the denomination to a nickel, dime, or quarter. However, the player is not allowed to play \$0.95 (i.e., a partial credit) in a \$1.00 denomination game. The claimed invention does allow such play. Because Wilms does not disclose, teach, or suggest a game played with partial credits, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wilms reference does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 4-21, 25-30, 32, 40, and 44-46 and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

With respect to independent claims 20 and 41, the Wilms reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest a gaming method where the player is able to define the credit value as a value “other than the standard denominations in which currency is issued.” Rather, the Wilms reference merely teaches that a player may select from a plurality of specified denominations (e.g., \$0.05, \$0.10, \$0.25, \$0.50, or \$1.00). These denominations are standard denominations in

Appl. No. 10/750,275  
Amdt. dated October 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 3, 2005

Docket No. 10407-989

which currency is issued (e.g., nickel, dime, quarter, half dollar, or dollar). Wilms does not teach that the player may select credit values of non-standard currency denominations as recited in claims 20 and 41. Because Wilms does not disclose, teach, or suggest that credit values have a value "other than the standard denominations in which currency is issued," the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wilms reference does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 4-21, 25-30, 32, 40, and 44-46 and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

**4. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42**

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilms (US 5,277,424).

The Applicants note that claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims 1, 33 and 41, respectively. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 3 of this response, the Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42 are not obvious in view of Wilms because this reference fails to teach or suggest "allowing a player to play the game for partial credits." Furthermore, the Wilms reference fails to teach or suggest that a gaming method where the player is able to define a credit value as a value "other than the standard denominations in which currency is issued." Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus, are independently patentable. In conclusion, the Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42 have been overcome.

**5. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 15, 16, 23-24, 36-37, and 43**

The Examiner rejected claims 15-16, 23-24, 36-37, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilms in further view of Skratulia (US 5,690,335).

The Applicants note that claims are dependent claims that depend from independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41, respectively. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 3 of this response, the Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-16, 23-24, 36-37, and 43 are not obvious in view of the combination of Wilms and Skratulia because these references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a method of "allowing a player to play the game for partial credits." Furthermore, Wilms and Skratulia, alone or in combination, fail to teach or

Appl. No. 10/750,275  
Amdt. dated October 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 3, 2005

Docket No. 10407-989

suggest that a gaming method where the player is able to define a credit value as a value "other than the standard denominations in which currency is issued." Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus, are independently patentable. In conclusion, the Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 3, 14, 34-35, 38-39, and 42 have been overcome.

### CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-31 and 33-46 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with the submission of this paper. However, if the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees from Deposit Account No. 502811, Deposit Account Name BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 28, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew B. Chen  
Reg. No. 48,508  
Customer Number 30076  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER LLP  
1880 Century Park East, 12th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1621  
(310) 712-8323 Telephone  
(310) 712-8383 Facsimile